UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,870	12/29/2003	Jeffrey A. Dean	Google-35APP (GP-090-00-U	3713

82402 7590 07/21/2011

Straub & Pokotylo
788 Shrewsbury Avenue
Tinton Falls, NJ 07724

EXAMINER	
TSUI, WILSON W	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/21/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/748,870	DEAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	WILSON TSUI	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 May 2011*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7,9-15 and 17-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7,9-15 and 17-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *20110606, 20110323*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This final rejection is in response to the amendment filed on: 06/06/2011, IDS filed on: 03/23/2011, and IDS filed on: 06/06/2011.

2. Claims 1, 7, 9 and 15 are amended. Claims 23 and 24 are new. Claims 8 and 16 are cancelled. Claims 1-7, 9-15 and 17-24 are pending. Claims 1, 7, 9 and 15 are independent claims.

3. The following rejections are withdrawn, in view of new grounds of rejection necessitated by applicant's amendments:

- Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 9, 10, 13-15, 17, and 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kahle et al (US Patent: 7,373,313 B1, issued: May 13, 2008, filed: Mar. 28, 2001, EEFD Apr. 25, 2000).
- Claims 3, 11 and 18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kahle et al (US Patent: 7,373,313 B1, issued: May 13, 2008, filed: Mar. 28, 2001, EEFD Apr. 25, 2000), and further in view of CNET (CNET.COM, page 1, December 7, 2001).
- Claims 4, 12, and 19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kahle et al (US Patent: 7,373,313 B1, issued: May 13, 2008, filed: Mar. 28, 2001, EEFD Apr. 25, 2000), and further in view of MSN (MSN.COM, page 1, Dec. 7, 2000).
- Claims 21 and 22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kahle et al (US Patent: 7,373,313 B1, issued: May 13, 2008, filed: Mar. 28, 2001, EEFD

Apr. 25, 2000), in further view of Barry et al (US Application: 2004/0015397 A1, published: Jan. 22, 2004, filed: Dec. 4, 2002, EEFD: Jul. 16, 2002).

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on 06/06/2011 and 03/23/2011 are being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 2, 5-6, 9, 10, 13-14 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kahle et al (US Patent: 7,373,313 B1, issued: May 13, 2008, filed: Mar. 28, 2001, EEFD Apr. 25, 2000), in view of Graham et al (US Patent: 6804659 B1, issued: Oct. 12, 2004, filed: Jan, 2000).

With regards to claim 1, Kahle et al teaches a method comprising:

a) *accepting, from an ad server and by a computer system including one or more computers on a network, information of an ad which includes ad content* (column 18,

lines 20-24: one or more web sites hosting ad/product data are accepted/traversed for ad/product data);

b) *using, by the computer system, a least one of terms, concepts and categories from the content of the ad to determine relevant content, from a content server, in addition to content of the ad, wherein the determined relevant content is one of (A) a news story, (B) a review, or (c) a user group message; and* (column 18, lines 18-40: whereas, the data server analyzes the ad data to realize further relevant product related data; the realized associations stored at the data server. The determined further content retrieved includes reviews, related products, store-location data)

c) *combining, by the computer system, at least a portion of content of the ad, from the ad server, and at least a portion of the determined relevant content, from the content server, for presentation to a user together with page content* (Fig. 2B: whereas, the data server combines the ad content with determined relevant content, such that a client program displays the ad and determined relevant content in an aggregated/pop-up-bubble form),

wherein the page content is (A) not directly used to determine the determined relevant content and (B) different than the content of the ad (Fig 2b, column 18, lines 18-24: whereas, relevant content is determined/association-established using an automatic search/crawling algorithm, the determined relevant content can be different

from the original ad and the relevant content collected from other data repositories is aggregated to include a collection of relevant content including a review of a product, location of where a product can be purchased, etc).

However, Kahle et al does not expressly teach combining, *automatically and regardless of any user input … to generate combined information; and d) serving an electronic document including the combined information to induce display of the electronic documentation on a user device.*

Yet, Graham et al teaches *automatically and regardless of any user input … to generate combined information; and d) serving an electronic document including the combined information to induce display of the electronic documentation on a user device* (Fig 11B, column 5, lines 57-67, column 15, lines 24-40: whereas ads are selected and combined using automatic relevancy techniques; such that they are served to a display).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Kahle et al's method for combining content and determined relevant content, such that information can be combined/aggregated and subsequently served automatically, as taught by Graham et al. The combination would have allowed Kahle et al to have "targeted advertising to online users without comprising user privacy" (Graham et al, column 1, lines 47-49).

With regards to claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Kahle et al *wherein the ad is for a product and wherein the determined relevant content is a review for the product* (Fig 2B: whereas, a recommended ad for a console with controller is shown).

With regards to claim 5, which depends on claim 1, Kahle et al teaches *wherein the determined relevant content further includes a search query related to the content of the ad* (column 20, lines 45-53: whereas, an additional query/search process is implemented to find further related content such as additional bids).

With regards to claim 6, which depends on claim 1, Kahle et al teaches *wherein the determined relevant content is a message from a user group* (Fig 2B: whereas, one or more customer review-group messages can be accessed/displayed).

With regards to claim 9, Kahle et al and Graham et al teaches for an apparatus, which performs a method similar to the method of claim 1, is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 10, which is dependent on claim 9, Kahle et al and Graham et al teaches for an apparatus performing a similar method to claim 2, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 13, Kahle et al and Graham et al teaches for an apparatus performing a similar method as in claim 5, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 14, which depends on claim 9, Kahle et al and Graham et al teaches for an apparatus performing a similar method to claim 6, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 17, which depends on claim 2, Kahle et al teaches *wherein the acts of (b) using the ad document information to determine content in addition to content of the ad document, and (c) combining at least a portion of content of the ad document and at least a portion of the determined content for presentation to a user together with page content* (as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1), and is rejected under similar rationale. Additionally, Kahle et al teaches the acts *are performed automatically by a machine executing machine-executable instructions* (Fig 1, column 3, lines 49-60: whereas a combination of hardware computers/machines are used to implement the steps/roles/instructions).

6. Claims 7, 15, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kahle et al (US Patent: 7,373,313 B1, issued: May 13, 2008, filed: Mar. 28, 2001, EEFD Apr. 25, 2000), in view of Kedem et al (US Application: US 2004/0260767 A1, published: Dec. 23, 2004, filed: Jun. 19, 2003).

With regards to claim 7, Kahle et al teaches a computer implemented method comprising:

a) *accepting, by a computer system including one or more computers on a network, document content information* (column 18, lines 20-30: one or more web sites hosting document data are accepted/traversed on the fly for ad/product data);

b) *using, by the computer system, at least one of terms, concepts and categories of the document content information to retrieve relevant content in addition to content of the document, wherein the retrieved relevant content is one of (A) a news story, (B) a review, (C) a search query, or (D) a user group message* (column 18, lines 20-40: whereas, the data server analyzes the document data to realize further relevant product related data; the realized associations stored at the data server. The determined further content retrieved includes user-group reviews/messages);

c) *using, by the computer system, the retrieved relevant content,* determining *further content, wherein the further* determined *content is at least one ad, received from an ad server, relevant to the retrieved relevant content* (Fig 2B, column 20, lines 45-53, whereas, determined content can be further used in a constructive associative manner to retrieve further data, such that more than one type of content is retrieved and aggregated. The further determined content can include an ad for related products); and

d) *combining, by the computer system, at least a portion of content of the document, at least a portion of the retrieved relevant content, and at least a portion of the* determined *further content for presentation to the user* (Fig 2B: whereas, the data server combines one or more parts of the document data/page content with determined relevant content (a review/group-message), and an advertisement data; such that a client program displays the combined information in aggregated/pop-up-bubble form).

However, although Kahle et al teaches *retrieve relevant content*, and determine further content, Kahle et al does not expressly teach *retrieving further content*.

Yet, Kedem et al teaches *retrieving further content* (page 4, claim 18 of Kedem et al: whereas, further content from a second advertisement campaign is retrieved from a data based/influenced from a first retrieved/activated advertisement campaign).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Kahle et al's method for combining content, relevant content, and further content, such that content can be subsequently retrieved can be combined/aggregated and subsequently served automatically, as similarly taught by Kedem et al. The combination would have allowed Kahle et al to have “analyzed vierwer’s interaction or coreate dynamic advertismenets or content which is modified to match the user's viewing format preferences” (Kedem et al, paragraph 0013).

With regards to claim 15, Kahle et al and Kerdem et al teaches teaches an apparatus, which performs a method similar to the method of claim 7, is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 20, which depends on claim 7, Kahle et al teaches *wherein the acts of (b) using the document information to determine content in addition to content of the document, (c) using the determined content, determining further content, and (d) combining at least a portion of content of the document, at least a portion of the determined content, and at least a portion of the determined further content for presentation to a user* (as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 7), and rejected under similar rationale. Furthermore Kahle et al further teaches that the acts are *performed automatically by a machine executing machine-executable instructions* (Fig 1, column 3, lines 49-60: whereas a combination of hardware computers/machines are used to implement the steps/roles/instructions).

7. Claims 3, 11 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kahle et al (US Patent: 7,373,313 B1, issued: May 13, 2008, filed: Mar. 28, 2001, EEFD Apr. 25, 2000), in view of Graham et al (US Patent: 6804659 B1, issued: Oct. 12, 2004, filed: Jan, 2000), and further in view of CNET (CNET.COM, page 1, December 7, 2001).

With regards to claim 3, which depends on claim 1, the combination of Kahle et al teaches a method comprising:

- *The at least one ad*, in claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.
- *The determined content relevant*, in claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale..

However, the Kahle et al does not expressly teach that the at least one ad, *is for a service and wherein the* determined relevant content *is a review for the service.*

Yet, CNET teaches at least one ad *is for a service and wherein* the determined relevant content *is a review for the service* (page 1: whereas, 'PC Connection' is the name of the service, and the review is indicated by a "star" ranking system).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Kahle et al's method for displaying advertisements of a particular subject matter and determining further relevant content, to have further included an advertisement for the determined content to be a review for a service, when a service was being browsed, as taught by CNET. The combination of Kahle et al, Graham et al, and CNET, would have allowed Barry et al's system to have been able to have provided service review information when the ad was a service.

With regards to claim 11, which depends on claim 9, for an apparatus performing a method similar to claim 3, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 18, which depends on claim 3, Kahle et al teaches *wherein the acts of (b) using the ad document information to determine content in addition to content of the ad document, and (c) combining at least a portion of content of the ad document and at least a portion of the determined content for presentation to a user together with page content* (as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1), and rejected under similar rationale. Additionally Kahle et al teaches that the acts *are performed automatically by a machine executing machine-executable instructions* (Fig 1, column 3, lines 49-60: whereas a combination of hardware computers/machines are used to implement the steps/roles/instructions).

8. Claims 4, 12, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kahle et al (US Patent: 7,373,313 B1, issued: May 13, 2008, filed: Mar. 28, 2001, EEFD Apr. 25, 2000), in view of Graham et al (US Patent: 6804659 B1, issued: Oct. 12, 2004, filed: Jan, 2000), and further in view of MSN (MSN.COM, page 1, Dec. 7, 2000).

With regards to claim 4, which depends on claim 1, Kahle et al teaches a method comprising:

- *The at least one ad*, in claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.
- *The determined relevant content*, in claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

However, Kahle et al does not expressly teach *wherein* the determined relevant content *is a news story about the product or service*.

Yet, MSN teaches at least one ad *is for a product or service and wherein* the determined relevant content *is a news story about the product or service* (MSN, page 1: whereas, MSN Messenger is the service, and news about MSN Messenger is provided as additional content).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Kahle et al's method for displaying advertisements of a particular subject matter and determining relevant content, to have further included an advertisement for the determined content to display a news story about a service as taught by MSN. The combination of Kahle et al, in view of Graham et al, and MSN, would have allowed Kahle et al's system to have been able to have provided service news information when the ad was a service type.

With regards to claim 12, which is depends on claim 9, for an apparatus performing a method similar to claim 4, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 19, which depends on claim 4, Kahle et al teaches wherein the acts of (b) using the ad document information to determine content in addition to content of the ad document, and (c) combining at least a portion of content of the ad document and at least a portion of the determined content of presentation to a user together with page content (as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1), and rejected under

similar rationale. Additionally, Kahle et al further teaches the acts *are performed automatically by a machine executing machine-executable instructions* (Fig 1, column 3, lines 49-60: whereas a combination of hardware computers/machines are used to implement the steps/roles/instructions).

9. Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kahle et al (US Patent: 7,373,313 B1, issued: May 13, 2008, filed: Mar. 28, 2001, EEFD Apr. 25, 2000), in view of Kedem et al (US Application: US 2004/0260767 A1, published: Dec. 23, 2004, filed: Jun. 19, 2003) and further in view of Barry et al (US Application: 2004/0015397 A1, published: Jan. 22, 2004, filed: Dec. 4, 2002, EEFD: Jul. 16, 2002).

With regards to claim 21, which depends on claim 7, Kahle et al teaches wherein the at least a portion of content of the document, the at least portion of the determined relevant content, and the at least a portion of the determined further content are combined, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 7, and is rejected under similar rationale.
However, Kahle et al does not expressly teach combined *as part of a single web page*.

Yet, Barry et al teaches a portion of content of the document, the at least a portion of the determined relevant content, and the at least a portion of the determined further

content are combined *as part of a single web page* (Fig 15: whereas, all portions of content are aggregated/combined in a single web page as shown).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Kahle et al's method for combining content, such that the content are combined as a part of a single web page, as similarly taught by Barry et al. The combination would have allowed Kahle et al to have implemented a system for a more enhanced way "to target advertising money" (Barry et al, paragraph 0005), by making the presentation of advertisement selection and presentation more effective.

With regards to claim 22, which depends on claim 15, the combination of Kahle et al, Kedem et al, and Barry et al teaches *wherein the at least a portion of content of the document, the at least a portion of the determined relevant content, and the at least a portion of the determined further content are combined as part of a single web page,* as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 21, and is rejected under similar rationale.

10. Claims 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kahle et al (US Patent: 7,373,313 B1, issued: May 13, 2008, filed: Mar. 28, 2001, EEFD Apr. 25, 2000), in view of Kedem et al (US Application: US 2004/0260767 A1, published: Dec. 23, 2004, filed: Jun. 19, 2003), and further in view of Graham et al (US Patent: 6804659 B1, issued: Oct. 12, 2004, filed: Jan, 2000).

With regards to claim 23, which depends on claim 7, Kahle et al teaches combining the at least a portion *content of the document, the at least a portion of determined relevant content, the at least a portion of determined further content,* as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 7, and is rejected under similar rationale.

However, Kahle et al does not expressly teach wherein the act of combining the at least a portion of content of the document, the at least a portion of the determined relevant content, and the at least a portion of the determined further content *is performed before the page is presented to the user.*

Yet Graham et al teaches the act of combining … *is performed before the page is presented to the user* (Fig 11B, column 5, lines 57-67, column 15, lines 24-40: whereas ads are selected and combined using automatic relevancy techniques; such that they are served in a page to a user's display).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Kahle et al's method for combining content such that the processing for combining can be executed at the client side, as similarly taught by Graham et al. The combination of Kahle et al, Kedem et al, and Graham et al would have allowed Kahle et al to have "targeted advertising to online users without comprising user privacy" (Graham et al, column 1, lines 47-49).

With regards to claim 24, which depends on claim 15, for a apparatus that performs a method similar to the method of claim 23, is rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7, 9-15 and 17-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

12. Additionally with regards to claim 1, the applicant argues that Kahle does not teach *"the page content is not directly used to determine the determined relevant content*" because the text of web pages is scanned (column 2, lines 7-11), and the client program preferably identifies the representation of the product on the web page (column 7, lines 26-30), and .... the data generation module preferably fetches web page after web page and *analyses each fetched web page to gather or collect product data .... the data generation module then fetches the web page for itself and analyzes the web page …* (column 18, lines 21-37). The examiner respectfully points out that the determined relevant content does not have to be based *solely* (directly upon) *upon the page content,* and rather the selection of content can be further based upon a combination of other additional information stored at a server, such as product - related data (column 16, lines 45-57). Thus, more than once source of input is used to determine what types of relevant content to server; and therefore, Kahle is maintained to teach the argued limitation.

13. With regards to claim 9, the applicant argues that it is allowable for reasons similarly presented for claim 1. However, this argument is not persuasive since claim 1 has been shown/explained to be rejected.

14. With regards to claims 2, 5, 6, 17, and claims 10, 13, and 14 for being allowable, since their independent claims for which they depend upon are allowable; is not persuasive since the independent claims have been shown/explained to be rejected.

15. The applicant argues with respect to claim 7, that the Kahle patent, however, does not use the already generated product-related data/information to identify the bid or sale offers. However, the examiner respectfully disagrees and points out that in column 20, lines 45-53, Kahle explicitly points out that identified data from already generated identified data are termed "previously identified products". Thus, since the previously identified products are used to identify bid or sale offers, than 'already generated product-related data/information' is in fact implemented, in order to identify the bid or sale offers, and therefore, the applicant's argument is not persuasive.

16. The applicant argues that claim 15 is allowable for reasons similar to why claim 7 is allowable. However, this argument is not persuasive since claim 7 has been shown/explained to be rejected.

17. The applicant argues that claim 20 is allowable since it depends upon claim 7. However, claim 7 has been shown/explained to be rejected, and therefore the argument is not persuasive.

18. With regards to claims 3, 11, and 18, for being allowable since they depend directly or indirectly upon claims 1 or 9; is not persuasive since claims 1 and 9 have been shown/explained to be rejected.

19. With regards to claims 4, 12, and 19, for being allowable since they depend directly or indirectly upon claims 1 or 9; is not persuasive since claims 1 and 9 have been shown/explained to be rejected.

20. With regards to claims 21 and 22, for being allowable since they depend directly or indirectly upon claims 7 or 15; is not persuasive since claims 7 and 15 have been shown/explained to be rejected.

Conclusion

21. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to WILSON TSUI whose telephone number is (571)272-7596. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Stephen S. Hong/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2178

/Wilson Tsui/
Patent Examiner
Art Unit: 2178
July 14, 2011